UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,783	08/23/2006	Takao Okajima	280072US0PCT	3980

22850 7590 10/29/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
MATTISON, LORI K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1619	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/29/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/553,783	OKAJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LORI MATTISON	1619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09/28/2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4 and 6-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *6-8* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4 and 9-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *09/28/2009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4, 6-13 are pending. Claim 5 is cancelled. New claims 11-13 are acknowledged. Claims 6-8 are withdrawn because they are drawn to an unelected method (i.e. method of cleansing a body cavity) or apparatus (i.e. navel cavity opener).

2. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 4, 9, and 10 filed 9/28/2009 are acknowledged.

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 are pending and examined on the merits.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Objections and rejections not recited in this action are withdrawn.

5. References not included with this Office action can be found in a prior action.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant requests that the English abstract of JP9-205699 be considered (Reply, page 14, paragraph 7).

The examiner has considered the English abstract of JP 9-205699.

The examiner notes that "Newly Edited Dentistry Engineering" submitted on 9/28/2009 has not been considered because it is an NPL document entirely in a foreign language. No English abstract or translation has been provided by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In the instant case, the structure of the composition is that of a pourable (i.e. flowable) material that solidifies (i.e. hardens) in 3 minutes or longer. It is noted that the phrase, "a navel cavity cleansing agent," provides no structural limitations to the composition of the instant claim, but rather describes the compositions intended use, A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Since instant claim 1 is a composition claim, the process step of pouring or applying the composition into the navel cavity only imparts the structural limitation of the composition having a low enough viscosity that it may be poured or spread.

With regard to the non-statutory subject matter, the claim encompasses a material which occurs in nature, i.e. pine sap/resin. As evidenced by "Plant Compounds," discloses that pine resin is a viscous liquid (page 1, abstract). "Plant Compounds" further discloses that the pine resin crystallize (i.e. solidifies) to entrap beetles (page 1, abstract) and that the beetles may struggle for hours in copious resin flows (i.e. it takes in excess of 3 minutes for the resin to solidify; page 1, paragraph 1 of the text).

To obviate this rejection under 35 USC 101, Applicant may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to amend the instant claim to recite a composition which is made by the hand of man rather than occuring in nature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 10 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Instant claim 10 recites, "...wherein the viscosity of said cleansing agent prior to pouring or applying is not greater than 3,000 mPa*s."

The claim is indefinite because the metes and bounds are unclear. It is unclear as to what temperature the viscosity of the composition is measured at. Viscosity is a temperature dependent parameter.

To obviate this rejection, Applicant may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to amend the instant claim to recite the temperature in which the recited viscosity occurs.

Claim 10 also recites the limitation "wherein the viscosity" in line 2 of the instant claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

To obviate this rejection, Applicant may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to amend the instant claim to recite, "wherein the cleansing agent prior to pouring or applying has a viscosity of not greater than 3,000 mPa*s.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3 remain rejected and new claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No 4,412,096 (Edgerton, 1983), as evidenced by "Questions" from Abilene Speech & Hearing Center Copyrighted 2002 accessed 10/16/2008 from http://www.abilenehearing.com/questions.htm, "Protocol for Earmold Impressions" as prepared by LT Andy Hayes accessed 10/16/2008 from http://www-mcphc.med.navy.mil/occmed/ProtocolForTakingAnEarmoldImpressionAndy**Hayes**.doc, and US Patent No. 4,891,400 (Schwabe, 1990).

Claim 1 remains rejected for reasons of record that may be found in a prior office action. With regard to the new claim limitation that the solidifying (i.e. curing) time required until the composition sets be 3 minutes or longer (instant claim 1), 3 to 20 minutes (instant claim 11) and 3 to 15 minutes (instant claim 12), Edgerton discloses the earmold is cured for about 15 minutes (i.e. 3 minutes or longer), prior to a hole being bored into the mold (column 1, lines 45-55; instant claims 1, 11 and 12). Thus, Edgerton discloses that it take about 15 minutes for the earmold material to solidify.

Claim 2 has changed only with regard to the amendments made to the independent claim 1 from which claim 2 depends. The amendments to claim 1 have been discussed above.

Claim 3 remains rejected for reasons of record which may be found in a prior office action.

Claims 1-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,254,811 (Finger, 2001).

Example 1 of Finger teaches an RTV-1(i.e. a silicone rubber; column 6, lines 55-60; column 7, lines 1-25; instant claims 2 and 9). The composition comprises dimethylpolysiloxane which has a hydroxyl group in each terminal unit (i.e. a reactive silicone base which comprises a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane; hardening component 1; instant claims 2, 3, and 9) and methyltrimethoxysilane (i.e. an alkoxysilane which comprises at least two alkoxy groups in the molecule; crosslinking agent, instant claims 2-4 and 9). Finger discloses that the skin formation time (i.e. the curing time to become a solid) is 20 minutes (column 7, lines 15-25; instant claims 1 and 9). Finger discloses that his reaction takes place at room temperature (column 4, lines 40-60). Finger discloses that his composition of Example 1 is applied to a joint produced between altoquartzite plaques (instant claims 1 and 9).

It is observed that while instant claims 2 and 9 require a two component hardening system, the instant claims do not require the two components to be separated. To overcome these rejections over the Finger reference under 35 USC 102(b), Applicant may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to amend the instant claims to require that the two component hardening system comprise a reactive base and a crosslinker, which are initially separated, and harden within 3-20 minutes of combining. Support for such an amendment can be found in the instant specification in Figures 3 (a)-(d) and Example 3. It is noted that the proposed amendment is a

suggestion. Applicant is not required to comply with the suggestion. This suggestion has been proposed to overcome the Finger reference only, and other rejections made under 35 USC 102(b) may be made with other prior art subsequent to such an amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4 remain rejected, claims 9, 10, and 13 are rejected, and new claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 4,412,096 (Edgerton, 1983), U.S Patent No. 5,360,858 (Fujiki, 1994), US Patent No. 4,714,739 (Arkles, 1987) and US Patent No. 56,74,966 (hereinafter '966) by McDermott, and newly applied reference US Patent No. 5,484,871 (Stepp, 1996).

Claims 1-4 remain rejection for reasons of record that may be found in a prior office action and above under 35 USC 102(b).

Rejection of new claims 11 and 12 are discussed above under 35 USC 102(b).

Edgerton teaches that dental molding materials may be used to form his earmold (column 4, lines 35-45). Edgerton teaches that the molding materials harden in about 15 minutes (column 1, lines 45-60; column 7, lines 1-10).

Edgerton does not teach a dental molding material which comprises a two component hardening material. Edgerton does not teach that the first component of the hardening material is a reactive silicone base which comprises an alkoxysilane which comprises at least two alkoxy groups and a diorganopolysiloxane which comprises at least two hydroxyl groups which is solidified within 3 to 20 as set forth by instant claim 9.

Edgerton does not teach the curing time is from 3 to 15 minutes as set forth by instant claim 13.

Stepp teaches organopolysiloxanes which comprise hydrophilic groups (title). Stepp teaches that his compositions may be utilized to a component in RTV-2 rubbers used for impressions (including dental implants), and as a component in implants (column 1, lines 15-35; column 9, lines 10-50). Example 1 of Stepp teaches a mixture which comprises an OH-terminated polydimethylsiloxane with about 220 Me_2SiO units (i.e. a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane comprising at least two hydroxyl groups; column 10, lines 15-20; instant claim 9) and triethoxylsilane (i.e. an alkyoxysilane with at least two alkoxygroups (instant claim 9; column 10, lines 25-35). Example 3 teaches that the composition of Example 1 forms a skin in 15 minutes (column 11, lines 1-10; instant claims 9 and 13). Stepp teaches that the mixture has a viscosity of 90 mm2/s (i.e. 90 cSt) which is about 90 mPa*s (instant claim 10).

With regard to instant claims 9, 10, and 13. it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the compositions of Edgerton and Stepp because Edgerton teaches substitution of dental molding material for the molding material of his instant invention and teaches that the molding material must harden in about 15 minutes. Stepp's composition may be used as an impression material (i.e dental molding material) and forms a skin within 15 minutes. Thus, the compositions of Edgerton and Stepp are usable together.

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,254,811 (Finger, 2001) and US Patent No. 5,744,199 (Joffre, 1998). Instant claim 9 is a composition claim which must be able to be applied to a cavity and solidify. The composition may be pourable or flowable, but the instant claim does require it. The composition just needs to be able to be 'applied." Thus, solids such as pastes or gels are applicable for meeting the claim limitation. The composition must comprise a reactive hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane and a cross linking agent which is an alkoxysilane which comprises at least two alkoxy groups. The mixture of the hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane and alkoxysilane hardens to a solid material within 3 to 20 minutes.

The limitations of instant claim 9 are addressed above under 35 USC 102(b).

Finger teaches that it is particularily preferred that the rate of the reaction (i.e. setting/curing) is from 3 to 20 minutes when at room temperature (column 4, lines 45-55; instant claim 13). This reaction time is a substantial advantage for preparing one pot RTV-1 compositions (column 4, lines 50-60; instant claim 13). Finger teaches that reaction rate is firstly dependent on the reactivity of the alkoxysilanes and secondly on the acid phosphoric ester (column 4, lines 50-60; instant claim 13). Finger embodies applying his RTV composition to the joint between altoquartzite plaques (i.e. natural stone plaques; column 7, lines 15-30). Finger teaches that his RTV compositions may be used for sealing joints in buildings, land vehicles, watercraft, and aircraft or may be used as adhesives or putties (i.e. they are sticky) in the construction of windows, display cabinets, protective coatings, and elastomeric moldings (column 6, lines 1-15).

Finger does not immediately embody a curing time from 3 to 15 minutes as set forth by instant claim 13.

With regard to instant claim 13, the adjustment of particular conventional working conditions (e.g. determining result effective curing time for the silicone rubber) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the ordinary artisan with said artisan recognizing that Finger taught that curing times between 3 to 20 minutes are particularily preferred.

Finger does not teach that the viscosity of the composition at the time of application is not greater than 3,000 mPa*s as set forth by instant claim 10.

Joffre teaches a method for sealing openings in joints (column 1, lines 15-20). The method involves applying a coating of a silicone composition with a viscosity from 1,000 mPa*s to 120,000 mPa*s over the filled opening (column 1, lines 60-end). Joffre teaches that the silicone composition is an RTV silicone composition (column 6, lines 20-30). Joffre teaches that the viscosity of the composition is adjusted by formulating the composition with low viscosity polymers (column 6, lines 30-40). Alternatively, organic solvents or low molecular weight cyclic or linear siloxanes may be added to adjust the viscosity of the composition (column 6, lines 30-40).

With regard to instant claim 10, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the viscosity of Finger's composition by lowering the viscosity of the composition to be

between 1,000 mPa*s to 120,000 mPa*s through the mechanisms taught by Joffre in order to have a composition which can flow into narrow joints, so that they can be filled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant traverses the anticipation rejections of claims 1-3 and the obviousness rejection of claim citing that Edgerton and Fujiki references and evidentiary references, "Questions, " "Protocol for Earmold Impression," and Schwabe, do not describe or suggest (a) a navel cleansing agent, (b) an agent that can remove dirt from the navel cavity, (c) navel cavity cleanser having the solidifying or curing time of 3 minutes or longer, (d) the cleansing agent of claims 9-10 and (e) the specific claimed combination of a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two hydroxyl groups in the molecule and an alkoxysilane containing at least two alkoxygroups in the molecule (as in claim 9; page 6, paragraphs 7-9; page 7, paragraphs 10-11; page 8, paragraph 2; page 9, paragraph 3; page 11, paragraph 3).

The traverse of claims 9 and 10, with respect to Edgerton, Edgerton was not used in the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 9 and 10 (Reply, page 7, paragraph 2). However, Edgerton was used as the primary reference of claims 9 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a). Edgerton teaches that the molding material must harden in about 15 minutes and that dental impression molding material may be used (column 4, lines 35-45; column 1, lines 45-60; column 7, lines 1-10). Since the composition of Stepp meets is to be usable in the dental arts, for making impressions, and cures within 15 minutes, it meets Edgerton's criteria and thus the two compositions are usable together (Stepp; column 1, lines 15-35; column 9, lines 10-50; column 11, lines 1-10). Applicant's

traverse that most conventional dental molding compositions harden within 3 minutes is unpersuasive (Reply, page 8, last paragraph).

With respect to the traverse in regard to the anticipation rejection over the curing time, Edgerton discloses that the curing time was about 15 minutes (column 1, lines 45-55). As discussed in prior office actions, Edgerton discloses the silicone material is inserted and needs time to cure (column 4, lines 45-50). Upon curing the material hardens (column 4, lines 45-50). Thus, Edgerton teaches a composition that is applied, cures to a solid material over a period of 15 minutes, which can be removed as required by the instant claims.

Applicant submits an excerpt titled "Newly Edited Dentistry Engineering" in their traverse of the anticipation and obviousness rejections to show that the curing time of most dental molding agents is within 3 minutes which is a shorter curing time than Applicant's present invention. Applicant alleges this curing time is due to the skill of professional dental staff, whereas nonprofessional individuals who desire a clean belly-button need a longer curing time (page 8, paragraph 3; page 9, paragraph 2; page 10, paragraph 2; page 13, paragraphs 1-3; page 14, paragraph 1).

Applicant's traverse has been considered but is found unpersuasive.

Edgerton teaches that dental molding material may be utilized, the molding material disclosed in "Newly Edited Dentistry Engineering" is not the same brand names as specifically recited by Edgerton for use in Edgerton's earmold. Furthermore, Edgerton explicitly states that the curing time is about 15 minutes (column 1, lines 45-55; column 2, lines 10-20) and Stepps composition may be used in impressions and

dental materials and is taught to harder within 15 minutes as required by Edgerton's teachings (Stepp; column 1, lines 15-35; column 9, lines 10-50; column 11, lines 1-10). Thus, it would be obvious to combine the inventions of Stepp and Edgerton.

Applicant traverses the anticipation rejection over the Edgerton reference. Applicant alleges that although the various silicones were known, Edgerton does not suggest selecting polymer having the claimed properties which are related to molecular weight of the polymer and used components. Applicant further alleges that the silicone polymers for an ear/mold dental mold does not have the same molecular weight and same properties as the polymers used as a navel cleansing agent (page 9, paragraph 4). Applicant further alleges with respect to the intended use of the composition, that the cleansing agent has to be capable of removing dirt from the navel (page 8, paragraph 1; page 12, paragraph 4). Applicant further alleges that one would not have been motivated with a reasonable expectation of success to use the composition for removing ear wax and dirt from the navel cavity (page 12, paragraph 5). Applicant alleges that the combination of references do not describe a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two alkoxygroups (as in claims 4 and 9) and therefore the combined references do not make the invention obvious (page 14, paragraphs 2-3).

Applicant's traverse has been carefully considered but is not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., molecular weight of the polymer) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the

claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With regard to the intended use of the composition, as shown by the evidentiary references, the materials used to make an ear mold are sticky and may grab debris such as earwax. Edgerton embodies use of the recited polymers of claims 1-3 in his earmold composition. The evidentiary references demonstrate that ear mold materials are capable of performing the intended use because the evidentiary references show that the materials used to form ear molds are sticky and may bind to earwax because that are sticky (Questions, page 7, paragraph 3) and that the "Protocol for Taking an Earmold" specifically states that, "Cerum will adhere to the cured earmold impression..." (page 1, paragraph 6). A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the limitations of the claim. The composition of the Edgerton reference has the same structure as that of the instant claim. There are no structural differences.

With regard to the expectation of success in regard to the traverse of the obviousness rejection of instant claim 4, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had an expectation of success in combining the Edgerton, Fujiki, Arkles, and McDermott references in order to improve the physical properties of the Edgerton reference such that the silicone material becomes more solid and diffusion through the silicone material

becomes limited. The fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Furthermore, there is no structural difference between the recited composition and that taught by the combined references. The composition is still capable of performing the recited intended use.

Applicant alleges that combination of references does not describe or suggest that dirt from the navel cavity can be removed with the cleansing agent of the cited references (Reply, page 12, paragraph 2). Applicant further alleges that dirt from the navel cavity is different from ear wax and ear wax debris (Reply, page 12, paragraph 2).

Applicant's traverse has been carefully considered but is not persuasive.

With regard to intended use of the composition, as discussed above there is no structural difference between the recited composition and that taught by the combined references. The composition is still capable of performing the recited intended use.

With regard to Applicant's traverse that ear wax and debris are different from the dirt found in the navel, the instant specification teaches that instant body cavity cleansing agent is for removing dirt. Applicant teaches that dirt may be belly button lint or ear wax (instant specification, page 1, paragraph 1) and that the cleansing agent of the instant specification may be used to remove both species of dirt (instant specification, page 1, paragraph 1). Since the composition of the instant specification is able to remove both dirt from both the belly button and ear canal and the teachings of the combined references have the same structure, then the structure of the combined

references are able to perform the use intended for the composition. Furthermore, as evidenced by "Protocol for Taking an Earmold," the materials used to take an earmold are able to remove earwax (i.e. ear dirt) further demonstrating that earmold materials are able to remove dirt.

Applicant traverses the 102(b) rejection over the Colas reference because it does not describe or suggest (a) a navel cleansing agent, (b) a navel cleaning agent having a curing time which permits its removal in 3-20 (or 3-15) minutes and (c) that the agent can remove dirt from the navel cavity (Reply, page 10, paragraph 2). Applicant alleges the long solidification time makes the composition unacceptable for removing dirt from the navel cavity (Reply, page 10, paragraphs 3 and 4). Applicant further alleges that just because the silicone rubber taught by Colas is meant to duplicate the details of wood grain, wood carvings from a master mold, it does not mean that the mold can be easily removed from skin and can also remove dirt (Reply, page 11, paragraph 1).

Applicant's arguments regarding the withdrawn art rejections of record have been considered to the extent they read on the new grounds of rejection over the Finger [102(b) and 103(a) rejections] and Joffre [103(a) rejection] references.

With regard to the intended use of the composition, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the limitations of the claim. In the instant case, the Finger reference meets the structural limitations of the instant claims, including the solidification times.

Furthermore, Finger teaches that his RTV compositions may be used as adhesives (i.e. they are sticky). Thus, the composition of the Finger reference would be able to adhere to dirt.

With regard to the solidification time, Finger embodies a skin formation time (i.e. the curing time) of 20 minutes and teaches that the preferred that the rate of the reaction (i.e. setting/curing) is from 3 to 20 minutes when at room temperature.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LORI MATTISON whose telephone number is (571)270-5866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-6pm (Monday-Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne (Bonnie) Eyler can be reached on (571)272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LORI MATTISON/
Examiner, Art Unit 1619

/Anne Marie Grunberg/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1661